EXAMINER INTERVIEW – PROPOSED AGENDA

DATE: NOVEMBER 13, 2003

TO: EXAMINER AVELLINO, JOSEPH E.

FAX/PH: 703-746-9314 (FAX)   703-305-7855 (PHONE)

FROM: JOSEPH T. VAN LEEUWEN

FAX/PH: 512-301-6742 (FAX)   512-301-6738 (PHONE)

RE: 09/631,722

Examiner Avellino:

   During of our upcoming telephone interview for the above-referenced patent application, I would like to discuss the following:

- The Office Action Summary indicates that claims 7, 18, and 27 are objected to, however no reference to these claims is made in the detailed office action. I assume that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and would like to discuss my assumption further.

- I would like to discuss the allowability of claim 6. The office action (page 9) states that Elledge teaches the selection of a default proxy server when a proxy server does not match a destination address. Elledge teaches that his mapping tables are preferably generated manually by a network administrator (col./5, lines 60-63). While the tables may be generated automatically, Elledge use of a default server does not teach or suggest how a default server can be automatically generated. In addition, Elledge teaches software that maps to servers (not proxy servers), and Farber teaches the use of repeaters. It does not appear that Farber's "repeaters" are interchangeable with Elledge's servers. One is dealing with network infrastructure components (Farber), while the other is dealing with a distributed application system (Elledge). As such, there does not appear to be a motivation to combine Elledge with Farber and Logue, nor do the references appear to be teaching the same area of art (Farber & Logan teaching network infrastructure with proxy servers and repeaters while Elledge teaches how a distributed application client reaches an application server). I disagree that Elledge is "analogous art" to that of Farber and Logue.

- I would like to also discuss the allowability of claim 8. Again, Elledge does not teach or suggest selecting a proxy server as alleged in the office action.

   Please call me at your earliest convenience when you have determined a date and time that you and your supervisor can discuss. I would appreciate being able to speak with you next week (11/17 – 11/21) as the week following is Thanksgiving week and the response is due the week after that.

   Thank you for your time and consideration.

Joe Van Leeuwen

Docket No. AUS000411US1   Atty Ref. No. IBM-0021

1